

*Comment B'*  
compressibility at least equal to 170 N and in particular in the range 175 N to 300 N.--.

The range of "175 N to 100 N" is obviously in error when referring to claim 7 as originally filed which recites "175 N to 300 N":

The value "100 N" is also obviously in error because the range recites from "175 N to 100 N" which is incoherent with regard to the common practice. As a matter of fact, ranges are usually given by reciting first the lowest limit and then the highest limit.

The correction is further obvious and unambiguous when referring to claim 7 as filed which recites "175 N to 300 N".

#### REMARKS

The Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner will address the Applicant's remarks as to the Restriction Requirement of March 22, 2002 at the time of allowance.

#### Nonstatutory double patenting rejection

The Examiner rejects claims 22 to 36 according to the doctrine of the obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 to 7 of U.S. Patent 6,451,122 and therefore requests a terminal disclaimer.

In conclusion of her examination of the obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner considers that claims 22 to 36 of the instant application define merely an obvious variation of the invention claimed.